LAW OFFICES OF 1 WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 2650 CALIFORNIA STREET, 26TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108-2615 3 T: (415) 981-7210 · F: (415) 391-6965 4 MICHAEL A. KELLY (State Bar #71460) mkelly@walkuplawoffice.com 5 RICHARD H. SCHOENBERGER (State Bar #122190) rschoenberger@walkuplawoffice.com MATTHEW D. DAVIS (State Bar #141986) mdavis@walkuplawoffice.com ASHCON MINOIEFAR (State Bar #347583) 8 aminoiefar@walkuplawoffice.com 9 SHANIN SPECTER (Pennsylvania State Bar No. 40928) (Admitted Pro Hac Vice) shanin.specter@klinespecter.com ALEX VAN DYKE (CA State Bar No. 340379) alex.vandyke@klinespecter.com 11 KLINE & SPECTER, P.C. 12 1525 Locust Street Philadelphia, PA 19102 13 Telephone: (215) 772-1000 Facsimile: (215) 772-1359 14 ATTORNEYS FOR ALL PLAINTIFFS 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND 17 DIVISION 18 Case No. 4:24-cv-01562-JST JANE ROE, an individual; MARY ROE, an individual; SUSAN ROE, an 19 individual; JOHN ROE, an individual; JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT 20 BARBARA ROE, an individual; PHOENIX HOTEL SF, LLC, a California limited liability company; ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO 21 FUNKY FUN, LLC, a California limited THE HONORABLE DISTRICT JUDGE liability company; and 2930 EL JON S. TIGAR, COURTROOM 6 CAMINO, LLC, a California limited 23 liability company, 24 Plaintiffs, Action Filed: 03/14/2024 Trial Date: Unassigned 25 v. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN 26 FRANCISCO, a California public entity, 27 Defendants. 28

 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$

jointly submit this Joint Case Management Statement focusing on proposed deadlines and discovery.

I. SCHEDULING

A. Preliminary Injunction

The Court requested a proposed briefing and witness examination schedule from both parties.

Pursuant to the Court's April 11, 2025 Minute Entry (ECF No. 93), the parties

The parties believe discovery for the purpose of the preliminary injunction can be completed by August 18, upon completion of all depositions of the Plaintiffs. The parties believe it would be reasonable for the City to receive 30 days to respond to Plaintiffs' motion. Plaintiffs would then file a reply 14 days after that. Plaintiffs anticipate they will call four to five live witnesses and also submit evidence in the form of written submissions, including deposition testimony, documents, photographs, and video recordings. As such, the parties propose a three-day hearing and the following schedule.

${f Event}$	Joint Proposal
Plaintiffs' Preliminary	August 25, 2025
Injunction Motion Due By	
Defendant's Opposition	September 22,
Due By	2025
Plaintiff's Reply Due By	October 6, 2025
PI Injunction Hearing	October 20, 2025
Day 1	
PI Injunction Hearing	October 21, 2025
Day 2	
PI Injunction Hearing	October 22, 2025
Day 3	
PI Injunction Hearing	October 23, 2025
Day 4 (if necessary)	

B. Case Schedule and Trial

Plaintiffs' Statement

Plaintiffs propose the following case schedule:

Event	Plaintiffs' Proposal
Fact Discovery Cut-Off	January 5, 2026
Opening Expert	January 19, 2026
Report Deadline	(2 weeks after close
	of fact discovery)
Rebuttal Expert	February 14, 2026
Report Deadline	(4 weeks from initial
	disclosure)
Expert Discovery Cut-	March 2, 2026
Off	(2 weeks from
	rebuttal disclosure)
Last Day to File	March 30, 2026
Dispositive Motions	(28 days after expert
	discovery cut-off)
Last Day to Hear	May 4, 2026
Dispositive Motions	(35 days after
(Monday, 2PM)	motion deadline)
Pretrial Conference	June 15, 2026
(Monday, 2PM)	
Trial	June 22, 2026
(M-Th, 8AM)	(7 Court Days)

Defendants' Statement

Defendants accept Plaintiffs' proposed trial schedule.

Defendant believes that the case could bifurcated to address the disability access and nuisance claims in separate motions for summary judgment.

Defendant shares the goal of efficiently trying this case before the Court, but cannot determine at this time the form of presentation of trial testimony. San Francisco requests 10 days for trial, inclusive of all parties' cases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

CIVIL L.R. 5-1(h)(3) ATTESTATION

I, THOMAS S. LAKRITZ, attest that each of the other signatories have concurred in the filing of this document, which shall serve in lieu of their own signatures on the document.

Dated: May 13, 2025

By: /s/Thomas Lakritz

THOMAS S. LAKRITZ Attorneys for Defendant CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO